

REMARKS

Claims 30, 32-36 and 40-55 remain pending in the application with the present amendments. In the Office Action, all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,851 to Saitoh et al. ("Saitoh") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,262 to Ogino ("Ogino"), or as obvious over Saitoh in view of Ogino and further in view of Kato et al. (6,470,496) and Sonoda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,004). Withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the reasons set forth below.

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Vent for the courtesy extended in granting the telephonic interview conducted on March 28, 2006. The Examiner's supervisor is also thanked for the consideration given to the rejections in view of the proposed agenda provided to the Examiner. As a result of the interview, agreement was reached to withdraw the rejections over the references cited in the Office Action, for reasons including as follows.

All of the independent claims of the application contain a recitation that

*content data are deleted from a recording medium when at least one condition specified by control information recorded on the recording medium is met.*

The condition to be met can be a time interval, permitted number of times for copying the content data, or a permitted number of times for reproducing the content data.

Ogino, col. 3, lines 1-25 is cited in the Office Action as teaching the deletion of content data when such condition is met. However, the cited passage of Ogino does not support this conclusion. This passage of Ogino, which appears in the background section of that patent, describes a problem of a prior art protection scheme that uses copy control

information. The passage at col. 3, lines 1-25 describes efforts (by persons pirating the content) to defeat copy protection by deleting the copy control information, but not deleting the content data. With the copy control information gone, e.g., replaced with different information, an unauthorized person can more easily use the pirated content.

Ogino neither teaches nor suggests deleting the content data when a specified condition is met, e.g., passage of time interval, permitted number of times for copying or reproducing the content information.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which she might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Daryl K. Neff

Registration No.: 38,253

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant